

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing on account of
Covid-19 Pandemic)**

201

CRM-M No. 19255 of 2020
Date of decision : 04.09.2020

Malkit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Ms. Sukhveer Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab
for respondent No. 1-State.

VIVEK PURI,J. (ORAL)

On 17.07.2020, the following order was passed:-

“Briefly, the FIR No. 33 dated 07.05.2020 under Sections 323/324/506/148 & 149 IPC, at Police Station Kahnuwan, District Gurdaspur has been registered on the basis of the statement of Satnam Singh alleging that on 03.05.2020 at about 10:00 AM, Mandeep Singh inflicted chhavi blow from reverse side on the back of the complainant, Kohli inflicted datar blow in between the forefinger and right thumb of the complainant and Malkit Singh, petitioner inflicted sword blow on the ring finger of the left hand. The brother-inlaw of Malkit Singh inflicted gandasi blow from the reverse side of the shin of right leg of the complainant. Baljit Singh gave two gandasi blows from the reverse side on the left leg of the complainant.

It has been stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that all the accused except the petitioner have been granted bail by the Court of Sessions. At the first instance, the

case was registered under Sections 323/324/506/148 & 149 IPC and arrest of the petitioner was effected and recovery was effected from him. Subsequently, the offence under Section 326 IPC was added. The injury under Section 3326 IPC is on the ring finger of the complainant. Furthermore, it is a case of version and cross-version and a compromise has also been effected between the parties.

Notice of motion.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State counsel has not disputed the factual position but has expressed his ignorance about the compromise if any, having been effected between the parties.

Adjourned to 04.09.2020.

Meanwhile, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the petitioner be admitted on interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer subject to the condition that he join the investigation and comply with other conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

It has been stated by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Kulwinder Singh, has not disputed the aforesaid fact(s).

In view of the above, the order dated 17.07.2020, vide which the petitioner was granted interim bail, is made absolute.

The petition stands disposed of.

04.09.2020

Rajeev (rvs)

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No